SenateRostrum

INITIATIVE

TASK FORCE

meet LEGISLATION

courses

PROGRAMS

Many Paths, Many Voices

by David Morse

Changes in Traditional Student Makeup and Recent Budget Cuts p 4

Professional Development: A New Chapter? p6

also in this issue

Previews of Coming Attractions for Spring 2015:

Many Paths, Many Voices

by David Morse, President

Fall 2014 was a very busy time in the California Community College System, with significant work taking place on AB 86 and Adult Education planning, Student Success and Support Program and Student Equity Plan development, the California Open Educational Resources Council, and the statewide technology initiatives—Online Education (OEI), Common Assessment (CAI), and Educational Planning (EPI)—among other programs and initiatives. Spring 2015 promises to be even more intense, with all of the 2014 initiatives continuing and a number of new efforts set to launch. The amount of work may feel overwhelming at times, but all of these projects can have significant impact on the California Community College System and therefore require faculty involvement. The brief descriptions and summaries that follow will help to update local senate leaders and others on various statewide initiatives and projects with information directly from and often in the words of the individuals most involved in or responsible for them.

2014 TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES

The three major statewide technology initiatives begun in 2014 continue to make progress. OEI Steering Committee Vice-Chair John Freitas, CAI Co-Chair Craig Rutan, and EPI Co-Chair Cynthia Rico report the following milestones or achievements expected in spring 2015:

The OEI Steering Committee approved Link-Systems to be awarded the contract for the online tutoring on December 5. Piloting of the OEI tutoring system starts in the spring 2015 term.

- The OEI Common Course Management System (CCMS) Committee will interview finalist vendors in the first week of February and expects to send a recommendation on the vendor for the CCMS to the OEI steering committee on February 6 for approval. Piloting is expected to being in fall 2015, although full-launch pilot colleges may have access to the system sooner.

- CAI will select the vendor or vendors for the system in February. Work to build the common assessment system is expected to begin in March.

- The CAI Professional Development workgroup will begin meeting in April to prepare for pilot college trainings in early fall.

- Portlets for the EPI's systemwide student services portal are currently under development. The first demo will take place at the end of January 2015.

- The EPI's Request for Proposals for an online education planning tool and a degree audit system has been sent, with the deadline for responses on January 23, 2015. The process of selecting a vendor will be done immediately after the deadline.

- A vendor to provide online orientation software which will be made available to colleges interested in this feature will be selected in spring 2015.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE BACHELOR'S DEGREES

The Community College Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program, created by Senate Bill 850 (Block, 2014), is moving forward. Although the ASCCC opposed this bill up until its passage, Academic Senate Resolution 9.04 F14 indicated that the ASCCC should "work with

the Chancellor's Office and local senates to ensure that community college faculty are appropriately represented on all task forces and other bodies, including any local committees, involved with the development and implementation of the community college baccalaureate degree pilot program." The Academic Senate has therefore continued to consult with the Chancellor's Office to ensure that any degrees offered through this pilot are developed through existing system processes and are held to strong academic standards.

Applications for inclusion in the pilot have now been submitted and read. Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs Pam Walker explains the process: "The Chancellors Office had 34 completed applications for the BA Pilot Project. We asked colleagues throughout the state to act as evaluators during the holiday break so that each application would be read at least three times. As part of the process, we also have our CSU and UC colleagues reading applications for their insights based on the Senate Bill. Chancellor Harris will review all documentation and will determine the specific number of applications to forward to the BOG by their January meeting." On January 20, the process described by Vice-Chancellor Walker culminated when the Board of Governors gave provisional approval for fifteen colleges to participate in the pilot. Those colleges will now take part in discussions to define the specific parameters for the degrees. The Academic Senate provided a number of the readers who reviewed the applications, and the Chancellor's Office has indicated that we will continue to play a significant role in the implementation process for the pilot.

Constance Carroll, Chancellor of the San Diego Community College District and one of the primary proponents of the community college bachelor's degree, describes the basis for the pilot as follow: "The essential benefit to students is a very important and practical one. It will enable them to obtain a bachelor's degree in a workforce field where this level degree is now required but which no public university offers. It makes only good educational and economic sense to enable these students to complete a four-year bachelor's program at a local community college. Community colleges are accessible, offer high-quality instruction in workforce fields where associate degree and certificate programs are already in place; and can accommodate the needs of working students who are not able to matriculate on a full-time basis."

Although the Academic Senate opposed the creation of the baccalaureate degree pilot at this time, we share Chancellor Carroll's interest in ensuring accessible, high-quality instruction that will benefit students and our communities. However, much work still remains and many questions must still be answered before any degrees can be approved and offered. Questions regarding funding, degree requirements, general education requirements, minimum qualifications, and others will be addressed in consultation with the colleges that have been chosen for the pilot. The Academic Senate will participate in all of these discussions, and in areas that fall directly under the heading of academic and professional matters, the ASCCC will play a leading role.

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS/ TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Development has now begun on the Chancellor's Office Technical Assistance Program, housed under the new Institutional Effectiveness Division and funded through a grant for which College of the Canyons will serve as the partner college and fiscal agent. Vice-Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness Theresa Tena notes that the purpose of the technical assistance program is to "facilitate the development of guidelines and technical assistance tools for districts which flow across instruction, student services, economic and workforce development, and fiscal areas. This effort will reach out to all our districts—those in need and stable districts—to provide a platform to highlight and allow cross pollination of exemplary programs between districts and colleges."

Diane Van Hook, president of partner college College of the Canyons and chancellor of the Santa Clarita District, describes the technical assistance program as "professional development for colleges" rather than for individuals. She expressed her enthusiasm for professional development by stating, "What an exciting thing to think that by learning, incorporating, changing, adjusting, adapting, and applying new knowledge and acquired competencies that we can become more effective, while redefining and shaping the changes that impact what we can do next. I see the Institutional Effectiveness Initiative as an opportunity for our colleges to do the same." Chancellor Van Hook notes that as many as one-third of the community college districts across the state

have already expressed informal interest in receiving input from the program, demonstrating the need for and importance of the initiative.

An executive committee for the technical assistance grant program and an advisory body to develop the program have been formed, both of them containing significant Academic Senate representation. The ASCCC welcomes the opportunity to work with Vice-Chancellor Tena and with College of the Canyons in what is developing as a very collegial and effective relationship.

TASK FORCE ON WORKFORCE, JOB CREATION, AND A STRONG ECONOMY

At its November 2014 meeting, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges commissioned a Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy. This body includes both representatives from constituencies within the community college system and from industry and our communities. According to the Chancellor's Office *Doing What Matters for Jobs and the Economy* website, the goal of the task force is "to increase individual and regional economic competitiveness by providing California's workforce with relevant skills and quality credentials that match employer needs and fuel a strong economy" (http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/StrongWorkforce.aspx). As aspects of this broad overall goal, multiple important topics and issues may be explored in order to benefit students, local communities, the State of California, and the Community College System. Lynn Shaw, Electrical Technology Professor at Long Beach City College and faculty co-chair of the task force, states, "I hope the task force will fully and authentically engage the varied and diverse voices of CTE faculty. While many people still say 'CTE or academic,' I hope the Taskforce will be able to change the narrative to 'CTE is academic.'"

Because the task force will be working on a short timeline, with its final meeting planned for July 2015, and because half of the task force members will come from outside the system, a broad structure for gathering input and background for the task force has been established. Numerous regional conversations involving community college administration, staff, and faculty have already taken place. Vice Chancellor of Workforce & Economic Development Van Ton-Quinlivan states, "Already, common themes are surfacing through the Regional College Conversations on what makes it hard for our faculty, staff, and

administrators to do their good work. The fixes require a comprehensive discussion, and the Task Force brings together the right mix to do just that."

The Academic Senate has been and will continue to be directly involved in the work of this task force. Four faculty members have been appointed as task force members. In addition to co-chair Lynn Shaw, faculty representatives will include ASCCC Vice-President Julie Bruno, San Diego Mesa College Math Professor and Curriculum Chair Toni Parsons, and Pasadena City College Counselor Lynell Wiggins. The Academic Senate will also be providing further support for the task force process and for the faculty appointees by holding regional meetings specifically intended to gather faculty input and by providing written explanations and documentation regarding such matters as curriculum processes and educational pathways. Finally, the ASCCC Futures Committee will be reconstituted to serve as support and provide input for the faculty appointees to the task force. Wheeler North, ASCCC Treasurer, will act as chair of the Futures Committee, which will also include two part-time CTE faculty members in order to ensure that part-time faculty issues are not overlooked in these important discussions.

LEGISLATION

The only legislation currently sponsored by the Chancellor's Office this year concerns concurrent enrollment. Details of this bill have not yet been released. Other bills currently published for the coming legislative cycle include AB 13 (Chavez) on veterans' exemption from nonresident tuition, SB 42 (Liu) to established a new Commission on Higher Education Performance, and SB 66 (Leyva) to further fund the Career Technical Education Pathways Program started by SB 70 (Scott, 2005) and SB 1070 (Steinberg, 2012). Two different bills involving accreditation coming from community college constituent groups are also expected, as is a bill dealing with full-time faculty hiring in both credit and noncredit programs and part-time faculty equity.

With so many activities, initiatives, and other efforts happening at the same time, faculty leaders and others may find themselves struggling to keep abreast of developments and to stay involved. The current pace of innovation and the constantly increasing workload in California higher education can be exhausting. However, Chancellor Brice Harris emphasizes the

Changes in Traditional Student Makeup and Recent Budget Cuts

by James Todd, Chair, Equity and Diversity Action Committee
and Jeff Burdick, Clovis Community College Center

The Equity and Diversity Action Committee (EDAC), which was reinstated in Fall 2014 as a standing committee of ASCCC, has been charged with responding to Resolution 13.07, "Changes in Traditional Student Makeup," from Spring 2010. The resolution is predicated on disproportionate impact through the budget cuts on historically underserved students in the community college system. The Resolves are as follows:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research how the state budget cuts have changed the makeup of our student populations and the impact that future cuts to education will have;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges discuss with its educational partners ways in which all educational segments can seek to support those historically underserved students who have been displaced by budget cuts; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges disseminate the results of its research and discussions and publish a *Rostrum* article on its findings.

To address this resolution, and in preparation for a discussion on the shifts in community college demographics at the upcoming Academic Academy in March, EDAC compiled several sets of statistics. Though the use of Datamart, the changes in community college demographics were plotted over a six-year period, fall-to-fall semesters in even-numbered years, beginning in Fall 2006 and ending with the 2012 term.

The community college student population dropped by 241,057 students between 2008 and 2012, which represents an enormous loss of opportunity, presaging a further loss of personal income and community growth. Although the losses were not identical across the spectrum of demographics, the losses were fairly uniform and proportional with some exceptions, which will be noted below.

Datamart designation	Loss % 2006 to 2012	Change % of population
African American	0.23%	7.21 → 6.98%
American Indian	0.37%	0.86 → 0.47%
Asian	0.72%	12.06 → 11.34%
Filipino	0.41%	3.53 → 2.97%
Pacific Islanders	0.22%	0.71 → 0.49%
White (non-Hispanic)	3.8%	35.9 → 30.36

CHART 1

Gender: The change in gender balance is interesting, for the long-term ascension of female students over male students slid a bit. Male students increased their representation about 2% during this period with a commiserate loss by female students.

Ethnicity: Given that all groups save one were negatively impacted by the budget cuts, the issue becomes one of determining the greatest losses to determine whether some groups were more damaged by the budget cuts than others. Chart 1 shows loss of representation in the California Community College System by ethnic designation.

The issue of multiple identities and unknown ethnicity complicates the data. In Fall 2008, fewer than 100 students claimed multiple identities because most were not given an opportunity to do so. By Fall 2012, 50,994 students were able to claim multiple identities, and they make up 3.22% of the population. Unknown ethnicity dropped during this time from a total of 170,354 students in 2006 to 86,851 by 2012, suggesting better data collection.

The Hispanic student population did not follow the other trends, as Hispanics grew from 29.3% of the total population to 38.68%, which was a gain of 8.3% and 129,496 additional students. (Chart 2)

The two dramatic shifts in the ethnic categories are the substantial drop in white (non-Hispanic) students and the substantial rise in the Hispanic students. The other shifts were modest, though any student shut out of the system is an unacceptable loss.

Age: The influx of high school students (<19 years) remains quite stable at 25% of the population, but substantial growth occurred in the 20-24 range with nearly a 6% rise in the population. Students 35 and older also suffered a substantial loss of population. (Chart 3)

Full-time (12+ units) versus part-time students: The percentage of full-time students rose from 26.63% to 30.38% during the same period.

Basic skills offerings: 175,271 fewer students took basic skills classes in 2012 than in 2008, and colleges offered 3,428 fewer sections of basic skills classes.

These statistics are absolutely worthy of reflection and engagement, and EDAC members look forward to your thoughts concerning the data. Importantly, the Senate Bill (SB) 860 trailer bill of June 2014 also put in statute the requirement of student equity plans, which may be an important avenue that will address many concerns regarding issues of access and success that various student populations face in the CCC system. With much work ahead of us in terms of equity, representation, and success, the secured funding for equity is a welcome step in the right direction. 🐦

CHART 2

Datamart designation	Gain % 2006 to 2012	Change % of population
Hispanic	8.32	30.36 → 38.68%

CHART 3

Age range	Gain (loss)	Fall 2006 → Fall 2012 % of population
>19	(0.12)	24.56 → 24.68%
24-24	5.81	27.36 → 33.31%
25-29	0.99	11.9 → 12.89%
30-34	(0.09)	7.5 → 7.41%
35-39	(1.29)	6.2 → 4.91
40-49	(2.33)	9.95 → 7.62%
50+	(2.41)	12.11 → 9.7%

Professional Development: A New Chapter?

by Dolores Davison
and Alex Immerblum, Professional Development Committee

Those of us who have been in the California Community College system for several years are familiar with the fluctuations that happen in our budgets. While the great recession of the past five years has been unusually difficult, faculty are well aware that one of the first things to be cut from college budgets is almost always professional development. Recent events, however, seem to indicate an increasing recognition that professional development for faculty, as well as the rest of the college community, is an essential element of ensuring that students receive the best educational opportunities possible.

As a starting point, the 2011 Student Success Task Force recommendations included specific language to provide professional development opportunities to faculty, prompting the Chancellor's Office for California Community Colleges (CCCCO) to create an ad hoc committee charged with making recommendations for professional development at all levels of the colleges. This committee's report, released in 2013, included very clear language regarding the creation and expansion of professional development on the campuses and throughout the system. In response to the report, a series of Professional Development Clearinghouse meetings were held around the state in November 2014 to gather information about what college faculty, staff, and administrators wanted in terms of professional development at their colleges and what types of professional development they were doing that would be replicable or scalable statewide. The Professional Development Clearinghouse, when created, will be available to all employees of California community colleges.

In addition, the passage of AB 2558 (Williams, 2014) establishes guidelines for professional development for all members of the college community and spells out specific requirements that colleges need to follow in order to receive monies from the state. While no funding source was indicated in AB 2558 and no source of dedicated monies has yet been established, the system continues to hope that such resources will be designated and that professional development may eventually be funded at a higher level than it has been in the previous decade. In Spring 2014 Academic Senate Resolution 12.01 resolved in part that "the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other constituent groups to establish through statute ongoing consistent and sustainable funding for the Professional Development Program." The ASCCC will continue to advocate for such dedicated professional development funding until it becomes a reality.

Finally, a new Success Center for California Community Colleges, another outcome of the ad hoc Professional Development Committee's report, has been created by the CCCCO and the Foundation for California Community Colleges. The Success Center will be led by Executive Director Paul Steenhausen, and when fully developed the Center will provide resources for faculty and staff professional development as well. David Morse, the ASCCC president, and former ASCCC Executive Committee Member Stephanie Dumont are serving on the advisory committee that is tasked with fully articulating and overseeing the vision of the Center.

Given this background information, at its Fall 2014 plenary session the Academic Senate held a breakout session on professional development and student success. This breakout, created and moderated by the ASCCC Professional Development Committee, sought to discover what colleges are doing now that can be replicated, what areas are lacking, and what college faculty leaders want in terms of professional development. The breakout was well attended, with more than 35 people in the audience, and a wide range of issues and topics were discussed.

An especially positive aspect of the breakout discussion was that, even with reduced funding, many colleges have been conducting innovative and interesting professional development programs. At Citrus College, for example, professional development has been guided by the concept of student engagement. Their professional development committee created focus groups, with the results of the groups discussed by their local academic senate. From this grass-roots effort they were able to design meaningful flex workshops. Other colleges, including Mt. San Jacinto and West Los Angeles, have created specific trainings for faculty which engage them in pedagogical discussions, and many other impressive examples of innovative professional development exist throughout the system.

These programs have been conducted in a time of limited financial and personnel resources, a situation which may change if the dedicated funding promised in AB 2558 is realized. As might be expected, this potential new funding has led to questions and concerns. One concern raised has been how colleges and their professional development committees define professional development; as faculty pointed out both at the clearinghouse summits and the breakout session, many colleges have begun including activities such as compliance requirements—sexual harassment training, for example—and calling them professional development activities. As we learn more about how colleges will incorporate more staff development as part of their professional development programs, local senates may face the challenge of defining professional development with an academic and professional focus rather than as a "catch-all" as has become increasingly common. The guidelines created in AB 2558 require that in order to receive state funding the college professional development committee must be integrated with all

groups on campus, including staff and administrators. However, according to Title 5 §53200 (c), professional development for faculty is an academic and professional matter and therefore continues to be an area that falls under the academic senate's purview. Determining how local senates will retain this purview while supporting the newest legislation is one of the issues that colleges will need to address.

Separate from the issue of redefining professional development, faculty at the breakout raised the continuing concern regarding who participates in faculty-focused professional development activities. In many cases, for example, these activities are not available to part-time faculty, who are unable to attend events or trainings at times or locations that do not fit their schedules. Participants at the breakout also indicated that some faculty have become comfortable and even complaisant with their current teaching practices are therefore are not likely to be interested in professional development that focuses on pedagogical or other kinds of trainings.

The brainstorming approach at the breakout revealed even more important questions: If the overall goal is to improve student success through improved instruction, how do we first define student success? This question becomes even more important given the shifting definition of student success that now focuses on identifying degrees and certificate completions and not life-long learning. Compounding this problem is the issue of adequate opportunities for professional development. Some colleges do not even have flex days, or only have one or two of them, so faculty focus on their own areas of study but are not provided the kinds of professional development activities that may, for example, help them improve their instruction. As monies become more available, discussions of flex activities and flex days will become more important, and faculty must be involved in those discussions.

This is an exciting time for faculty in the area of professional development. Colleges must engage in discussions about potential increases in professional development funding but also about how to make better use of currently available resources and how to design effective professional development activities and events. With the recent focus on professional development from the legislature and the Chancellor's Office, the faculty voice in these discussions will be critical in ensuring the quality and value of local professional development programs.

Unraveling the Mystery of Statewide Appointments

by Julie Adams, Executive Director
and Craig Rutan, South Representative

One of the core pieces of the Academic Senate's mission statement is that AS-CCC "fosters the effective participation by community college faculty in all statewide and local academic and professional matters; develops, promotes, and acts upon policies responding to statewide concerns." While the members of the Executive Committee act as representatives in statewide discussions, the executive committee cannot fulfill this mission alone. The Senate puts on many events every year to provide interested faculty with professional development opportunities on topics including accreditation, curriculum, and effective leadership. If you have ever attended a Senate event, you have seen faculty presenting on a wide array of topics. Most of the presenters at the plenary sessions and other senate events are members of the Academic Senate's committees. The Academic Senate depends on broad participation of faculty throughout the state to help fulfill its mission through the work of its committees and task forces.

Senate committees are where most resolutions are addressed, publications are developed, and many *Rostrum* articles and session presentations are born. Some have asked how standing committee membership is determined. Appointments to standing committees begin with the selection of the committee chair. Immediately following the elections at spring plenary session, the president works with the vice president and the executive director to select the committee chairs and other Executive Committee members to serve on each standing committee. Selecting additional committee members begins with reviewing the Applications for State Service, which are found on the Senate website. The application for service is an essential link between the Academic Senate and the faculty, as it provides the Senate staff and the Executive Committee with vital information about a faculty member's willingness to serve their interests and background from work at the local and statewide level. Using this information, the Senate staff compiles all of the applications and distributes a list of interested faculty to each committee chair. The committee chair then works with the president, the executive director, other members of the Executive Committee, including past committee chairs, local senate presidents, and others, to create a list of possible committee members.

What does the Senate consider when making these appointments? The Senate seeks to appoint a diverse group of faculty to serve on its committees. This consideration includes diversity in race, ethnicity, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability status, age, cultural background, veteran status, discipline or field, and experience as outlined in the Inclusivity Statement on the Senate website. The Senate

also attempts to maintain a balance between representatives from the north and south and to include representatives from small, medium, and large colleges. Beginning with the list provided by the Senate Office, the committee chair contacts individuals to determine if they have the requisite skill and experience and are willing and able to serve. Once the committee chair has identified the possible membership of their committee, the list is submitted to the president and executive director, who review the recommendations to ensure that perspective committee members have not been chosen for another committee, as well as to review potential applicants for diversity, regional balance, and prior experience. For those appointed to the Senate standing committees, the Executive Committee approves the membership.

Are standing committees the only opportunities to serve?

While standing committee members are often the most visible Senate representatives, more than 150 additional faculty members represent the Senate in a variety of venues. In 2014-15 the Senate has appointed representatives to all three technology initiatives (Common Assessment Initiative, Educational Planning Initiative, and Online Education Initiative) and their workgroups, Chancellor's Office committees, task forces, and advisory groups, intersegmental groups, and the C-ID System as faculty reviewers. All of these appointments are made as they are requested, which may occur any time during the year. As the requests for faculty appointments are received, the president works with the executive director to identify faculty with the background to participate on a particular group. These

qualifications could include experience with online education, curriculum, course design, technology, particular disciplines, and many more. Once possible candidates have been identified, the executive director contacts the local senate president to determine if the faculty member would be a good fit for the appointment. If endorsement of the local president is received, the faculty member is approved to serve. Unlike appointments to standing committees, these appointments do not come to the Executive Committee for approval.

What makes appointments to other groups different? These appointments are often needed immediately, but the Executive Committee may not meet before the appointment is needed. In order for the Senate to effectively advocate for the faculty, representatives need to be present at all meetings. If making an appointment had to wait for the Executive Committee's approval, decisions might be made without faculty input. In addition, the Executive Committee may have no experience with potential applicants, so the local senate president approval should be sufficient to support the appointment since he or she has direct experience with the potential appointee.

Whether selected to serve on a standing committee or some other group, each appointee makes the work of the Senate possible. Without faculty volunteers, the Senate would not be able to participate in so many important conversations and help shape the future of the California community colleges. If you have not completed an Application for State Service, we highly encourage you to add your name to the list of those already participating at the state level. You can find more information and the Application for State Service on the Senate website. ✒

> Without faculty volunteers, the Senate would not be able to participate in so many important conversations and help shape the future of the California community colleges.

Automatic Awarding of Degrees and Certificates

Considerations for Local Senates

by John Freitas, Area C Representative, Educational Policies Committee Chair
and Cynthia Rico, Area D Representative, Transfer, Articulation and Student Services
Committee Chair

With the current state and national focus on student completion, colleges are exploring ways to increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded annually to students in order to demonstrate that their students are completing their educational goals. While our students may have other goals besides earning a degree or certificate, the reality is that policy makers and legislators have emphasized the importance of students earning degrees and certificates. Since policy makers influence legislators, and because legislators hold the purse strings, colleges need to demonstrate to the public that their students are earning degrees and certificate in a timely manner.

With the advent of degree audit software, one potentially attractive method for increasing degree and certificate completion is to use the software to audit the coursework that students have completed, and automatically award degrees and certificates if they have completed the required coursework.

At the Fall 2012 Plenary Session, the Academic Senate adopted Resolution 13.01 F12, Automatic Awarding of Earned Degrees or Certificates:

> Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges investigate the positive and negative impacts of automatically awarding earned degrees or certificates, including the methods through which such a practice could be facilitated, and report the results of this research by Fall 2014.

In response to this resolution, a survey was distributed to the field in Spring 2014 to determine what colleges were doing with regard to automatic awarding of degrees. The Senate received 39 responses to the survey, of which only three colleges (7.7%) indicated that their colleges automatically awarded degrees or certificates to their students. One college responded that it notifies students that they will be awarded the degree if they meet specific requirements (completed at least 60 units, have an education plan on file, have a valid application on file to verify recent attendance), but the student has the

right to opt out of the award; however, the college discontinued this process in Fall 2013 due to SB 1456 (Lowenthal, 2012) implementation. Another college had a less automatic process: it required the students to "apply for a degree and most certificates." Furthermore, this college responded that "certificates with an identified capstone course are auto awarded if the student passes the capstone course with a C grade or higher."

Even though only three colleges responded that they have some form of a process for automatic awarding of degrees and certificates, nearly half of the respondents (46.9%) replied that their colleges have considered automatically awarding degrees or certificates but decided against such a process. The reasons for this decision included technology limitations, staffing limitations, effect on eligibility for Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), and a simple lack of institutional priority. However, the reason most frequently cited for not implementing automatic awarding of degrees and certificates was the potential impact on eligibility for student financial aid. Such concerns are indeed legitimate and need to be addressed if a college is considering implementing automatic awarding of degrees and certificates. Above all else, the most important consideration regarding automatic awarding of degrees and certificates must be what is best for students.

The benefits of automatically awarding degrees and certificates seem obvious. Clearly, it would be convenient for the students because they would not need to complete graduation petitions. Colleges would also benefit because more completions would be reflected in their Scorecard data. Furthermore, students would leave the college with a degree or certificate in hand, which may increase employment and earnings potential. In addition, given that many of our students are the first in their families to attend college, earning an associates degree is a source of pride and accomplishment, not only for the students but also for their families. Any faculty member who has attended college graduation ceremonies has observed this first hand.

However, completing a program of study, particularly an associates degree, affects a student's status at the college in several ways, and automatically awarding degrees may result in unintended consequences that harm students. In particular, completion of a degree affects financial aid eligibility, registration priority, and the ability to obtain a different degree and may affect transfer to a four-year institution.

In its Federal Student Aid Handbook[1], the U.S. Department of Education details the eligibility requirements students must meet to receive federal student aid. The basic requirement is that the student must be enrolled as a regular student in an eligible program. The handbook defines a regular student as "someone who is enrolled or accepted for enrollment in an eligible institution for the purpose of obtaining a degree or certificate offered by the school." In order to maintain eligibility for federal student aid, the student must maintain minimum scholarship standards as required by the institution, such as meeting minimum grade point average requirements and making satisfactory progress towards the degree or certificate. Students who receive federal student aid are also limited in the number of units they can attempt (not complete). This limit, known as the 150% Rule, is 150% of the number of units required to complete the degree or certificate. For example, if a student states that his or her educational goal is to earn an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT), which by Education Code is 60 units, then that student can attempt up to 90 units of coursework to complete that degree and maintain his or her federal student aid eligibility. Finally, and most importantly, eligibility for receiving federal student aid ends once the student earns an associate degree or certificate. This limit also applies if a student states that his or her goal is a credit certificate. However, students who complete a certificate program may continue their studies and pursue

---

1   The 2014-2015 Federal Student Aid Handbook is found at http://ifap.ed.gov/fsahandbook/attachments/1415FSAHandbookCompleteActiveIndex.pdf

an associate degree. In that case, students will retain their eligibility for federal student aid until they earn the associate degree or reach the 150% attempted units limit. Once a student earns an associate degree, the loss of eligibility is final unless the student transfers to a four-year institution to earn a bachelor's degree or appeals the loss of eligibility and regains it.

Consider the example of a student pursuing the ADT in Physics, which by law is a 60-unit degree. However, the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) template also recommends that students should take additional coursework that could not be included in the degree due to the 60-unit requirement, such as chemistry and differential equations, prior to transfer in order to be prepared for upper division study in the major.

Normally, that student would be allowed to attempt up to 90 units while maintaining financial aid eligibility. However, if that student is automatically awarded the degree before he or she takes the additional coursework recommended in the Physics TMC template, the student will have lost his or her federal student aid eligibility and will have to pay the cost of taking those additional courses at the community college out of pocket. Furthermore, because that student has completed the degree, he or she may lose registration priority, which may make completing the additional recommended coursework prior to transfer difficult.

If a college automatically awards a student any degree that can be attained by combining a collection of eligible courses, then a student may earn a degree that he or she did not intend or want to earn. Many of our students change their minds multiple times about their majors before deciding on a major. After declaring a major, some students may have actually completed enough coursework to qualify for a different degree without even realizing it. If degrees are awarded automatically, then students may be awarded degrees they did not seek to earn before completing their intended degrees.

A student might also complete the requirements for a local (non-ADT) degree while intending to earn an ADT and transfer to the CSU. An example might again be the student who intends to earn the ADT in Physics. The student could complete enough coursework to earn a local area of emphasis such as in the humanities or fine arts and be awarded that degree before he or she has completed the requirements for the ADT in Physics. That student will not only lose financial aid eligibility and registration priority, but he or she will also lose the transfer admission priority to the CSU afforded to students who complete the ADT. Furthermore, unless the local board policies state otherwise, that student may not be able to complete the ADT in Physics he or she intended to complete because of being awarded the other degree.

Clearly, a college or district considering implementing an automatic award process needs to have thoughtful dialog about the impacts on students. Given that this discussion would clearly include considerations about degree and certificate requirements and student success policies, both of which are within the academic senate's purview under Title 5 §53200 (c), local senates need to be actively engaged in these discussions, and collegial consultation must take place before policies and procedures are adopted. As part of any automatic award process, the degree or certificate awarded should be the student's identified educational goal, as stated in his or her educational plan and financial aid application. Additionally, the student should be notified well in advance of being awarded a given degree certificate that it will be awarded, and the student should be given the opportunity to meet with a counselor to review his or her options, which must include the option to decline being awarded that degree or certificate. The benefits of automatically awarding degrees and certificates to students may seem clear, but local senates must carefully consider all of the potential beneficial and adverse impacts on their students before recommending the implementation of a process for automatically awarding degrees and certificates at their institutions. 🦅

Best Practices for the Development of New Courses

by Sofia Ramirez Gelpi, Ph. D., Allan Hancock College, ASCCC Curriculum Committee member and Terrie Hawthorne, MSW, Moreno Valley College, ASCCC Curriculum Committee member

Faculty members are interested in developing innovative, vibrant, engaging curriculum. They can generate creative ideas and topics for courses that may appeal to students and be interesting to teach. However, simple creativity and appeal are not the only factors to consider when determining whether a course should be developed. In addition to compliance and curricular standards, Academic Senate Resolution 13.04 F11 states that course development and enrollment management should be guided by demonstrated student and community educational need, as well as be fiscally and academically responsible. Student and community need can be defined in a number of ways and supported by both quantitative and qualitative data. Available resources are also an important consideration in determining the viability of a course. All of these factors should come into the discussion when new curriculum is being proposed and developed.

To determine need, a curriculum committee might consider data available from its college or district Institutional Research Office, such as existing enrollment management data that may show trends, outlooks, gaps, and emerging patterns. FTES projections and demographic data could also be included, as might existing retention and success data for the program that the new course would be in. The college may also consider student surveys, but such surveys should include students other than prospective majors in the discipline, since asking kinesiology majors if they would take advantage of a potential new kinesiology course is like asking children if they like candy. A carefully crafted student survey that goes out to all students at the college would provide more accurate data on this issue of need.

Colleges might also consult with external advisory boards in the area to determine whether the need for the course is real or perceived. Discipline faculty might gather data by contacting community agencies or making a presentation and gathering feedback. They can also consult with employers and industry to learn if career technical education (CTE) courses meet their needs. If the course is CTE-oriented, the faculty might gather agendas and minutes from relevant agencies that document need for the course. To further establish need, the course proposal might include data related to employment opportunities that include salary and wage information. The college's financial aid office can indicate whether the course or program is counted in gainful employment data that is reported back to the federal government. All of this data will help to show clearly that students will acquire unique skills that enhance their employability.

Counselors can also provide valuable input regarding course development and student need. With regard to transfer-level courses, counselors can indicate whether trends appear in course requests, especially concerning general education requirements that have limited course offerings or are difficult for students to register for. Counselors can provide information of an anecdotal nature about student need as well as documented evidence of students' movement within the college: what courses they take, what courses they want, and what they look for and need. Further, counselors can share information on UC and CSU transfer pathways and show trends based on students' educational goals that provide a glimpse into what is needed to petition for graduation. Finally, counselors might help to establish whether the course could fulfill general graduation or transfer requirements.

After compiling solid data documenting the need for a new course, the proposers might be asked to develop a student recruitment plan. This plan could consider outreach opportunities within the college as well as outreach to high school students, the community at large, and area employers. It might also factor in the cost of developing promotional materials such as brochures and fliers or even publishing an article or advertisement in the local newspaper.

Another crucial factor for successful course development is determining that adequate resources are in place. For example, college librarians can conduct a library holdings inventory analysis to determine whether the library has all the support materials students may need in order to be successful in the course. If such materials are not in place, the new course proposal may need to indicate the associated cost of obtaining the materials and who will absorb the cost. The proposal might also be required to indicate that existing facilities are adequate to offer the new course or that new facilities are needed. If existing facilities would need to be upgraded, this need might also be indicated along with the associated cost. Similar consideration should be given to supplies, equipment, and technological needs.

Personnel resources are an additional important factor to consider in course development. The college must have qualified instructors to offer the course. If no full-time faculty can be identified to teach the course, a sizable pool of part-time faculty might be considered as a substitute, at least on a temporary basis. Ongoing evaluation and revision of curriculum is a faculty responsibility, so without full-time faculty in place the college will need to identify part-time faculty committed to initiating revisions and sustaining currency of the course. In addition to faculty, the course proposal might also indicate the existence of sufficient support staff, such as lab technicians or necessary coordinators.

Finally, the curriculum committee should consider the appropriateness of the course to the mission of the California community colleges in general and to the mission of the local college. New curriculum is generally expected to support current statewide initiatives and the local college's area needs.

A new course is an opportunity to bring forth innovative and exciting curriculum that provides new and valuable educational experiences for students. However, all new course proposals should be scrutinized to ensure that they are addressing real student and community need and that the college has sufficient resources to offer the course. Curriculum committees have an obligation to ensure that students are being taught what is needed, that students will be properly prepared for transfer, that students will be properly prepared for employment, and that CTE courses meet industry standards.

importance of the faculty role in all of these discussions in the following statement: "All of us in California community colleges are serving in a time of unprecedented change. The speed and complexity of that change is daunting, and the work involved in supporting that change is tremendous. However, we cannot make significant change to our colleges without adequate faculty involvement, advice, and counsel on every issue. Whether it relates to teaching and learning, accreditation, career technical education, student success, access, adult education or the community college baccalaureate, robust faculty involvement is a necessity."

Chancellor Harris' words are important for all of us to remember. While we may often feel frustrated or fatigued by the seemingly constant stream of new demands on our time and energy, our colleges and our students need our involvement and our commitment to participate in all of these efforts. The Academic Senate will continue its work to provide information and resources that encourage and enable faculty involvement at the state and local level in order to ensure the best possible outcomes for all of the initiatives and projects in which we are engaged and in others that are certain to come.

Updating "Part-Time Faculty: A Principled Perspective"

by Dolores Davison, Chair, Part-Time Paper Task Force

At its Spring 2013 Plenary Session, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) passed resolution 19.07, which stated,

Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a task force consisting of both full and part-time faculty charged with updating the 2002 paper 'Part-Time Faculty: A Principled Perspective' to reflect progress achieved and challenges remaining to the original paper's policy level recommendations and best practice suggestions for local senates, and to make further recommendations related to the status of part-time faculty as needed by the Spring 2014 Plenary Session.

In response to this resolution, a task force was formed in Fall 2013, comprised of full- and part-time faculty from a range of colleges, to create an update to the 2002 paper. That task force brought forward an outline to the Executive Committee which was approved in March 2014. Over the summer, and through the fall, the task force met by phone, divided up the outline, and worked on the update. During this process, task force members became increasingly convinced that the original 2002 paper did not need to be updated. Instead, the task force suggested that information about specific topics regarding part-time faculty issues that fall under the Academic Senate's purview (the 10+1) needed to be provided to the field. At its January 2015 meeting, the ASCCC

Executive Committee agreed, recommending that portions of the draft paper be crafted into *Rostrum* articles about part-time faculty issues, including an examination of the recommendations from the original 2002 paper.

The recommendations from the 2002 paper were that the ASCCC work towards the following:

1. Increase the number of full-time faculty;

2. Increase efforts to integrate part-time faculty at the local and state level;

3. Reaffirm the guidelines in the ASCCC 1989 paper "Part-Time Hiring Procedures: A Model Based on AB 1725";

4. Undertake a comprehensive review of part-time hiring and evaluation processes, procedures, and their implementation;

5. Develop mentoring models for part-time faculty;

6. Work with the Consultation Council and the Board of Governors to develop mechanisms that ensure equitable opportunities for effective contact outside the classroom;

7. Reaffirm that part-time hiring be done for academic and programmatic needs, not financial ones;

8. Enhance professionalism and advise the Board of Governors regarding policies for employment security and due process for part-time faculty;

9. Consider a tenure-like process for part-time faculty who have been regularly rehired and have gone through rigorous evaluation.

Locally, the paper recommended that senates work with their boards, collective bargaining units, administrators, and others to

1. Establish principled definitions and policies regarding part-time pay equity;

2. Establish paid office hour support;

3. Work to create office hour alternatives as appropriate.

Many of the above recommendations have been advocated for and worked on by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges since the paper's publication in 2002. The Academic Senate has worked to increase part-time participation at both the state and the local level, and part-time faculty members have been appointed to numerous statewide committees, including the recent (2014) technology initiatives (the Online Education Initiative, the Common Assessment Initiative, and the Educational Planning Initiative). The Academic Senate also has recognized and supported the work of the ASCCC Part-Time Caucus and has provided for a permanent liaison from the part-time faculty to the Executive Committee. Other efforts by the ASCCC have included the following:

1. A change in the Hayward Award structure to ensure that part-time faculty are recognized every year for excellence in teaching and leadership, including recognition of part-time award recipients at the March Board of Governors meeting in that year. Two of the ASCCC's geographic areas each year nominate only part-time faculty, and the other two geographic areas nominate full faculty. The first Hayward Awards for part-time faculty members were given in 2014, to Rebecca Sarkisian from Fresno City College and John Sullivan from Riverside City College. The 2015 Hayward Award will be awarded to part-time faculty from Areas B and C.

2. Scholarship opportunities for part-time faculty to attend institutes and plenary sessions, sponsored by the Academic Senate Foundation for California Community Colleges. As a result of these scholarships, part-time faculty have had the opportunity to attend the Accreditation Institute, the Academic Academy, the Curriculum Institute, and other events at no or low cost to the faculty member and his or her college.

3. *Rostrum* articles on the importance of part-time faculty, including the inclusion of part-time faculty in campus-wide activities, shared governance, professional development, and other areas which fall under the purview of the Senate. The most recent of these, on part-time faculty and professional development, was published in the Fall 2014 *Rostrum* and was co-authored by a part-time faculty member who is serving on the Professional Development Committee.

4. Plenary breakouts on part-time faculty and their contributions, as well as on ways to integrate part-time faculty into the campus community. In addition, opportunities for part-time faculty to network with the ASCCC Part-Time Caucus have been provided at the plenary sessions since the creation of the Part-Time Caucus.

5. Continued recruitment of part-time faculty for ASCCC committees and task forces, including involving part-time faculty in the technology initiatives and other statewide appointments.

6. The creation of an ASCCC listserv for part-time faculty.

Other areas of involvement for part-time faculty are under discussion, including the creation of a Professional Development College module dedicated exclusively to part-time faculty. Part-time faculty have been and remain an integral element of the success of students in the California community colleges, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges will continue to work to provide opportunities for their professional development and involvement at both the state and local level.

Preparing Faculty to Teach Online

by John Freitas, Area C Representative, Online Education Committee Chair
and Christina Gold, El Camino College, Online Education Committee

Interest has increased in recent years regarding the expansion of access to courses through the growth of online[1] education offerings. During the Great Recession and with subsequent reductions in course offerings, policy makers and politicians viewed the expansion of student access to higher education through increased online education offerings as a cost-efficient panacea for the access problems that California college students in all segments faced. In the 2013-14 state budget, the California legislature authorized funding for the Online Education Initiative[2]. A key component of the OEI is developing and providing tools and resources for faculty preparation and readiness to the California community colleges. However, given the long-standing disparity in retention and success rates between in-person and online courses, the need for professional development to prepare faculty to teach in the online environment has long been recognized prior to the advent of the OEI.

Even as online course offerings increase and online student retention and success rates improve, retention and success gaps between in-person and online education courses persist. As of 2013, the Chancellor's Office reported that the seven-year average of in-person retention and success rates are 84.5% and 66.4% respectively, while distance education and retention and success rates are 77.4% and 55.9%.

Faculty development for online instruction enhances student success and retention and is encouraged and required by federal and state agencies. In addition, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) accreditation standard IIIA.14 requires that campuses provide and evaluate the effectiveness of ongoing professional development programs for distance education faculty that include online teaching and learning methodologies.

At the Spring 2013 ASCCC Plenary Session Resolution 19.06 S13 was adopted by the body:

> Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges survey colleges to determine what local requirements exist for certification of faculty to teach in the distance education modality and communicate those results to the body by Spring 2014.

In response to this resolution, the Academic Senate's Distance Education Task Force conducted a survey in Fall 2013 to determine how California community college faculty are being prepared to teach online.

With 53 respondents, the survey results reveal that colleges are providing training in a diversity of ways and are at a variety of different stages in developing and enacting that training. Some colleges provide extensive and careful training, while others provide very little or none at all, relying on outside vendors

---

1   For the purposes of this article, online education is the same as distance education (DE). Online or distance education courses, as defined by the U.S. Department of Education courses (C.F.R. Title 34 Section 600.2, http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/ECFR?page=browse) are courses in which part or all of the student contact hours are offered online and for which there is regular and effective contact.

2   See OEI article in the September 2014 *Rostrum*

for training of their faculty. At the time of the survey, many colleges were in the process of developing their online faculty training programs.

Faculty preparation should include both technical training in the use of the course management system (CMS) and training in effective pedagogical methods for online instruction. A majority (59%) of California community colleges require faculty training in order to teach online, and most of these colleges (58%) provide training that combines pedagogy in online teaching with technical training in a CMS. In addition, many of the colleges surveyed that do not require training nevertheless make training opportunities available to faculty. The nature of the technical training required by a college correlates with whether or not a college has a common course management system. Faculty training may be easier to provide when one CMS is in use. Of the 23.1% of colleges that permit faculty to select their own CMS, 87% do not provide support for all CMSs. Per ACCJC standard IIIC.4, colleges that allow the use of more than one CMS are expected to ensure that equivalent levels of training and technical support are available to faculty and students for each CMS. "In house" online faculty training is provided by 81% of the colleges surveyed. Other forms of training are provided by a third-party vendor, through @ONE or the through the CMS vendor.

While only 59% of colleges require faculty training, 78% of colleges do offer professional development credit for completing training and 21% offer unit credit applied towards the salary scale. Provision of "other" credit, which may include monetary compensation such as stipends or reassigned time, constituted 12% of the responses, and 12.5% responded that their faculty collective bargaining agreements allow for additional mandatory training beyond the CMS training. In addition to the initial training to begin online instruction, 64% of campuses reported that they provide ongoing training and supplemental training materials.

When asked what role their senates played in training faculty for the online environment, 41.5% of respondents answered that their senates review and approve training policies and guidelines. On the other hand, 36.6% replied that their senates played no role in such training. Title 5 §53200 identifies "policies for faculty professional development activities" as an academic and professional matter under the purview of academic senates. Therefore, depending on locally established processes, local senates may take a role in developing local policies for preparing faculty to teach online.

Faculty should participate in training on teaching in the online environment because such training supports quality instruction and student success. ACCJC accreditation standard IIIA.1 also requires that the "institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing administrators, faculty, and staff who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services," and standard IIIA.14 requires that colleges "provide all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs." In its *Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education* (2013, pages 25 and 27)[3], the ACCJC is quite clear that it expects institutions to consider the qualifications of faculty selected to teach online and that colleges with online programs must include in their professional development offerings professional development for online faculty.

Faculty may ask why they are being required to undergo additional training to teach online while additional training is not required of faculty that teach in-person classes. While online courses have the same objectives and student learning outcomes as in-person courses, an instructor's online course cannot simply mirror what he or she does in the classroom. In *The Excellent Online Instructor: Strategies for Professional Development*[4], Palloff and Pratt explain that online education trainers need to be cognizant of the widely varying skills and online teaching experiences of the trainees and be responsive to their needs and interests. Online instructors must be trained to use technology to teach and measure the objectives and outcomes in different ways. Therefore, online faculty need professional development in the technological

---

3   Note: This guide is based on the June 2012 revision of the standard and is found at http://www.accjc. org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Guide_to_Eval- uating_DE_and_CE_2013.pdf

4   Palloff, Rena and Keith Pratt. (2011). *The Excellent Online Instructor: Strategies for Professional Develop- ment.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

and pedagogical tools necessary for building an effective and engaged online learning community.[5] The online format requires different presentations and pedagogical approaches that make effective use of technology such as multi-media, chat rooms, discussion boards, and file sharing. In addition, many faculty assigned to teach online have little experience with taking online courses themselves and hence have fewer effective online teaching models to emulate than they do with in-person instruction, thus creating a need for additional training relevant to online instruction.

Training for the online environment should include instruction in the pedagogy of online teaching and technical training in the development of online materials and the use of a CMS. Training begins with the essential understanding that teaching online is at least as labor intensive as classroom instruction. Faculty must ensure instructor-initiated regular and effective contact with their students. Federal regulations, state regulations, and accreditation standards require that colleges have policies on regular and effective contact in order to ensure course quality and to ensure that online faculty are meeting their students on a regular basis that is equivalent to the faculty-student contact in in-person courses. Regular and effective contact is an academic and professional matter per Title 5 §55204(a)[6], and therefore policies[7] on regular and effective contact require collegial consultation with local senates. In order to ensure regular and effective contact, faculty-

student interaction and student-student interaction are necessary. Student retention and success benefit from ample student-student and faculty-student interaction that creates an online community of students and personal presence by the instructor.

Online faculty instructors also need to be trained to meet the evolving pedagogical and technical requirements of state and federal agencies for online education. This training should include ways to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and methods for authenticating student identity, which is required by the Higher Education Opportunity Act to avoid financial aid fraud and cheating. In addition, local senates should encourage their faculty to make thoughtful decisions about the extent of their use of publishers' course materials in lieu of instructor created content and assessments.

Local senates should consult with their union colleagues before developing policies that establish preparation requirements for faculty to teach online. If the local union has negotiated for online faculty training, then it may be required by the collective bargaining agreement. If training requirements are in the contract, the contract language should clarify whether the requirements pertain only to learning the CMS or also to learning online pedagogy and course design. Local collective bargaining agreements may specify a responsible party, such as a distance education committee, for ensuring that any mandated training and certification for faculty occur before faculty are assigned to teach online. Even if a collective bargaining agreement is silent on training and preparation matters, the senate and union should engage in dialog in order to ensure that a high quality distance education program is provided for the students while respecting the workplace rights of online faculty.

With the current emphasis on expanding online education for students in the California community colleges, faculty, through their senates and curriculum committees, must engage in dialog about the quality of their online education programs. Through the collegial consultation process, local senates play a central role in ensuring that professional standards are established for faculty training. Faculty must recognize that teaching online requires skills and training not only in the use of technology but also in effective pedagogical methods for teaching in the online environment. ◀

---

5   Training in online pedagogy is available to faculty through @ONE (http://www.onefortraining.org) at low cost.

6   Title 5 §55204(a) Any portion of a course conducted through distance education includes regular effective contact between instructor and students, through group or individual meetings, orientation and review sessions, supplemental seminar or study sessions, field trips, library workshops, telephone contact, correspondence, voice mail, e-mail, or other activities. Regular effective contact is an academic and professional matter pursuant to sections 53200 et seq.

7   The regular effective contact policy at Mt. San Jacinto College is an excellent example of such a policy and is found at http://msjconline.com/images/Regular_Effective_Contact_staff.pdf

AB86 Update And Next Steps

by John Stanskas, ASCCC Secretary

Assembly Bill 86 (2013) requires regional consortia of adult education systems to confer and address the following areas:

- Elementary and Secondary Basic Skills;

- Classes for Immigrants (ESL, Citizenship);

- Adults with Disabilities;

- Short Term Career Technical Education; and

- Apprenticeships.

In the March 2014 issue of the *Rostrum*, the ASCCC Noncredit Task Force updated the field about the history of adult education in California and the mechanics of the Adult Education Consortium Program, AB86, in a highly referenced article. Work on the AB 86 consortia has continued and further developments have transpired since that time, and faculty need to be aware of these developments for the purposes of future planning locally and statewide.

UPDATE SINCE MARCH 2014

Local consortia are collaborations among at least one community college district and one K-12 district and a myriad of local providers of adult educational services. These consortia were tasked with reporting to the Chancellor's Office at the end of July, October, and December of 2014 on the progress they had made up to those points. The Chancellor's Office hired a consulting firm, the McKinsey group, to shepherd the analysis of the reports. In October, a regional planning summit was held to assist consortia leaders in moving forward and encourage faculty involvement. In November, the state level AB 86 Workgroup was expanded to include faculty representatives from both the community college and K-12 system.

The consortia reports were to address seven objectives, the first three in the July report:

1. Evaluate current levels and types of services

2. Evaluate current needs in the region

3. Plan to address gaps in capacity, curriculum, and other areas

The additional four objectives were to be included in the October report:

4. Create seamless transitions for students

5. Employ proven practices to support a student's progress toward his or her goals

6. Improve professional development for faculty and staff

7. Leverage existing regional structures.

The December report submitted by regional consortia served to update and add to the seven objectives as work continued.

The timeline for these reports, which is driven by the mandated report due to the legislature by March 1, has been a subject of concern for many faculty throughout the state. However, faculty have emphasized that the purpose of this process is to respond to the legislature and that planning by the AB 86 consortia will continue to evolve as faculty involvement increases.

In November, the members of the new, expanded workgroup were assigned to review the local consortia reports and then discuss key findings. Most of the consortia did an excellent job of identifying services and gaps in services in the region. This work utilized a variety of demographic data available to research teams in the regions. As of the October reports,

consortia had a more difficult time addressing the last two listed objectives: improving professional development and leveraging existing regional structures. The ASCCC has urged that the active participation of faculty in these objectives is crucial to any workable plan. Active participation of faculty in the expanded workgroup appears to have influenced the dialog and conclusions. The narrative report, membership of the workgroup, and other useful information can be found at http://ab86.cccco.edu.

The workgroup concluded the calendar year by drawing out several messages from the consortia reports that are important to convey to the legislature. The first is that the significant and growing demand for adult education in California has been exacerbated by the Great Recession and subsequent cuts to education. Second, a significant gap exists between enrollment capacity and the need for adult education services. Lastly, while AB86 has spurred partnerships and collaborations, much work remains to meet the needs of Californian adults. Some of the recommendations to address the identified need include the following:

- Increase service levels by hiring more full-time classroom and counseling faculty

- Evaluate and improve curricula to ensure student needs are met and aligned within each consortia

- Strengthen professional development both within existing systems and among employees of different systems

- Improve wrap-around services to students such as child care and academic support

- Align assessment for placement, to use the common assessment project across provider systems

- Establish structures for ongoing regional coordination.

NEXT STEPS AND CONSIDERATIONS

While the ASCCC is pleased with the inclusion of faculty in the AB86 Workgroup, the faculty leaders of CoFO, the Council of Faculty Organizations , have drafted a letter to Brice Harris, Chancellor for California Community Colleges, and Tom Torlakson, California Superintendent of Public Instruction, to urge greater faculty involvement in AB86 processes in order to ensure that the individuals who most closely work with students can provide direct input on meeting the goals of the legislature and

needs of the public. For community college faculty, student progress, advisement, and success as well as curriculum are clearly academic and professional matters. The same professional judgment is also needed from the teachers in the K-12 system. Faculty who are interested in participating in their local planning process should not hesitate to reach out to their local regional consortium primary contact to learn how to become more involved. The listing of regional consortia primary contacts can be found by visiting http://ab86.cccco.edu and going to the consortia tab.

Another update from the regional consortia has been collected and the December reports are being evaluated by the AB86 Workgroup for additional information and planning that may have been lacking in the October update. This additional information should further inform and shape the recommendations submitted to the legislature.

Local colleges have difficult discussions to navigate, as the conversations regarding AB86 intersect with other trends and decisions as well. The Board of Governors Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy directly relates to the short-term career technical education (CTE) component of AB86. The budget language from the governor to increase the apportionment rate of career development and college preparation (CDCP) noncredit to the same as the credit rate may spark an entirely new curriculum discussion regarding what serves students best. Community College Career Development and College Preparation Program (CDCP) curricula directly address the goals of AB86.

Lastly, while the final consortia reports are due in March 2015 for this phase of AB86 planning, the governor's budget includes language to provide $500 million dollars to fund these plans. Funding the plans is intended to establish a unified adult education system that will offer more choices for California citizens to build skills that can earn them a living. This budget is expected to fund the existing capacity as well as expand services available to adults. The ongoing work on curricular alignment, student success, and professional development will require careful planning and attention from local academic senates to assist in improving outcomes through this new system.

The New Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy:

An Overview and a Call for Participation

by Julie Bruno, Vice President
and Wheeler North, Treasurer and Futures Committee Chair

I n January of 2012, the Student Success Task Force published its final report with recommendations that would impact in multiple ways the California Community College System. In September 2014, Chancellor Brice Harris announced that by Fall 2015 the system would have addressed all 22 of these recommendations and was thus in a position to embark on another state level policy initiative. Therefore, at its November 2014 meeting the Board of Governors commissioned a new Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy to examine workforce preparation education in California.

The new Workforce Task Force has the potential to significantly affect our colleges, our communities, our faculty, and, most importantly, our students. Faculty, individually and through their local senates, must become engaged with this broad state-level initiative. The ASCCC will keep faculty around the state informed regarding the task force's progress through *Rostrum* articles, email updates, and breakouts at Academic Senate institutes and plenary sessions. As this newly formed body begins its work, local senates and faculty at large first need to be familiar with the task force's composition and charge and of the ways in which the ASCCC will support the faculty representatives and promote participation and input from all faculty and senate leaders.

TASK FORCE OVERVIEW AND ASCCC REPRESENTATIVES

As the website dedicated to the Workforce Task Force states, the goal of the task force is "to increase individual and regional economic competitiveness by providing California's workforce with relevant skills and quality credentials that match employer needs and fuel a strong economy. The task force is to consider strategies and recommend policies and practices that would:

1. Prepare students for high-value jobs that currently exist in the state,

2. Position California's regions to attract high-value jobs in key industry sectors from other states and around the globe,

3. Create more jobs through workforce training that enables small business development, and

4. Finance these initiatives by braiding existing state and federal resources."[1]

To complete these tasks, the task force membership, appointed by Chancellor Brice Harris, includes 26 representatives evenly split with half of the members representing a variety of business, labor, workforce training, education, and

---

[1] See doing what matters: http://doingwhatmatters. cccco.edu/StrongWorkforce/Overview.aspx

community-based organizations and the other 13 members representing the faculty, administrators, and students of the California Community College system.

The process of making appointments to a large, high-level policy body can be difficult and controversial. Many constituencies and individuals have vested interests in the outcome, and yet few possess a perspective that is sufficiently broad and diverse to assert significant representation while being specialized enough to ensure meaningful participation that yields functional results. Furthermore, one goal of the task force is to engage in dialog that unites stakeholders by reaching across all areas of California's Community College mission. In initial conversations with the Chancellor's Office, the ASCCC was invited to identify for appointment three faculty members who could bring expertise in career technical education, general education, and basic skills. However, this initial proposal would have excluded important voices. For example, a central component of student success is the intersection between teaching and support, especially as students navigate the many possible academic and career pathways from high school to college or directly into the workforce. Counseling faculty are therefore critical to the success of all students and offer a perspective that had to be included in the task force's deliberations. Additionally, task force discussions are likely to cross into various issues which could impact local bargaining agreements, and thus a bargaining agent voice was necessary. Finally, some of the most significant topics of consideration for the task force are expected to deal with various aspects of curriculum, and therefore both the expertise of a local curriculum chair and a direct connection to the Academic Senate were important faculty perspectives to include.

Taking all of these considerations into account and working in consultation with the Academic Senate, Chancellor Brice Harris agreed to include a fourth faculty member on the task force and appointed the following faculty to serve:

- Lynn Shaw, Task Force Co-Chair, Electrical Technologies Professor, LA/OC Regional Consortia Vice-Chair, President Long Beach City College Faculty Union

- Julie Bruno, ASCCC Vice President, Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup Chair, Executive Committee liaison to C-ID and Statewide Career Pathways Steering Committee member, Communication Studies Professor, Sierra College

- Toni Parsons, Curriculum Committee Chair, Basic Skills- Math Professor, San Diego Mesa College

- Lynell Wiggins, Counselor for CTE students and member of Statewide Career Pathways Steering Committee member, Pasadena City College

As a result of the variety of experience and knowledge of the faculty representatives, the task force will benefit from expertise in local and state curriculum processes, counseling process and practices, statewide projects including C-ID, Transfer Model Curriculum, Model Curriculum, and Statewide Career Pathways, the protection of employee rights provided by our negotiating representatives, and the assurance of decisions well-aligned with existing governance requirements and ASCCC positions.

TIMELINE

To support the work of the task force, the Chancellor's Office has organized the process into three phases. Phase one is a series of regional meetings to receive feedback from college administrators, faculty, and staff in three areas of interest: completion, responsiveness, and funding. Eleven of these regional conversations hosted by the Chancellor's Office were scheduled, beginning in late November and set to conclude in early February. To ensure the participation of faculty, the ASCCC, in partnership with the Chancellor's Office, will hold three additional regional meetings February 27, 28, and March 13 (time and location is available on the Academic Senate website). The feedback from all of these regional meetings will be combined and used to inform the task force's discussions. Currently, the feedback is categorized

into five overarching areas: 1) workforce data and outcomes; 2) curriculum and instructors; 3) structured career pathways and student support; 4) baseline funding; and 5) regional coordination.

The second phase is a series of five Strong Workforce Town Hall Meetings. These meetings will be held in various locations across the state and will seek input from leaders in business, industry, community organizations, and others on creating stronger alignment between the California Community College system and industry. These meetings will take place in Sacramento, Mountain View, Los Angeles, Fresno and San Diego beginning in mid-February and continue through March.

The third phase is the task force meetings, January through July. The first meeting, which was primarily an introductory information session rather than a discussion, was held on January 22. The task force will meet four additional times throughout spring and summer to develop a set of system recommendations. Once the task force finalizes the recommendations, two additional town hall meetings will occur in August for dissemination and discussion of the recommendations. The recommendations will then go to Consultation Council for discussion in August and finally, for consideration by the Board of Governors in September. A full schedule of all of the regional conversations, town hall meetings, and task force meetings can be found at http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/StrongWorkforce/Overview.aspx.

THE FUTURES COMMITTEE

To support the faculty representatives on the Workforce Task Force, the ASCCC has reconvened the Future of California Higher Education Ad Hoc Committee, commonly called the "Futures Committee." Originally created to study "the on-going role of the California community college system within California higher education," the Futures Committee supported the faculty representatives for the Student Success Task Force and will play a similar role for the faculty representatives on the Workforce Task Force. The Futures Committee will research Academic Senate positions, investigate, analyze, and summarize

information, gather and synthesize input from the field, and assist in prioritizing faculty interests in the deliberations.

Wheeler North, ASCCC Treasurer and Aviation faculty at San Diego Miramar, will chair the Futures Committee. The Futures Committee members include the above mentioned task force members, ASCCC President David Morse, and ASCCC Executive Director Julie Adams. Additionally, to recognize the critical role of part-time faculty in CTE programs, Arnita Porter, Real Estate faculty at West Los Angeles College, and Shawn Carney, Drafting faculty at Solano College, have also been appointed to serve.

WHAT'S NEXT?

The Workforce Task Force is charged with improving our students' educational experience and preparing them for the workforce in California. The Academic Senate needs the help of all faculty in this effort. The timeline to complete the task force's charge is aggressive, and the work demands our full attention and our best ideas. The regional college conversations, the Strong Workforce Town Hall Meetings, and the Task Force Meetings are all open events. The ASCCC encourages local faculty leaders to promote and support faculty attendance at the ASCCC regional meetings in February and March, to disseminate information on the progress of the Task Force to faculty, administrators, and staff, and to attend ASCCC events such as the Spring Plenary Session and the Vocational Education Institute to participate in the conversation and provide feedback to the task force representatives. All faculty can also visit the Workforce Task Force Webpage frequently and provide feedback on the work of the task force by clicking on the "feedback" button.

Inquiries, comments, or questions are welcome and may be directed to President Morse at dmorse@lbcc.edu, Vice President Julie Bruno at jbruno@sierra.edu, or Treasurer Wheeler North at wnorth@sdccd.edu. The recommendations coming out of this process need to be based on well-informed contributions from all perspectives. Only with full faculty participation can we help to guide the work of the task force and ensure positive outcomes for our colleges, our communities, and our students.

"You Want Me to Drive WHERE?"

A Look at the Representative Areas of the ASCCC

by Kale Braden, Relations with Local Senates Chair

A t its Spring Plenary Session of 2014, the Academic Senate passed resolution 01.05 *Evaluate Representative Positions of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Executive Committee:*

Whereas, The number and possibly the geographical distribution of local member senates is different today than when the representative positions (Area A, B, C, D, North, South, and At-large) of the Executive Committee were established;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges evaluate whether or not the current representative positions (Area A, B, C, D, North, South, and At-large) of the Executive Committee are adequate and equitable to the number and geographical distribution of local member senates and report the findings to the body by Spring 2015.

The ASCCC Relations with Local Senates Committee was assigned the task of researching this issue and presented a breakout on this research at the 2014 Fall Plenary Session.

THE HISTORY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE AREAS

California is by population the largest state in the union and by geography the third largest in the country. With 72 districts and 113 community colleges as of Fall 2015, the California Community College System educates ¼ of all community college in the nation.1 The size of the system presents unique challenges for the Academic Senate to ensure that all 113 colleges have a voice and have the opportunity to participate in statewide discourse. The question of how the representative areas of the ASCCC are divided has been returned to the body for consideration on a regular basis.

The ASCCC was incorporated as a nonprofit corporation in 1970 to "represent local senates at the Chancellor's Office and before the Board of Governors."[2] According to the 1977 ASCCC Annual Report, in the 1970s the ASCCC was divided into five areas (http://goo.gl/TV9Wpt)

ASCCC records do not indicate when the organization moved from five areas to four. By the early 1990s, as colleges and the ASCCC were attempting to implement changes to the system wrought by AB1725 (Vasconcellos, 1988), the ASCCC developed a Local Senate Network to coordinate input from geographically "close" colleges. This

---

[1]   Foundation for California Community Colleges (2015). About the Colleges. http://www.foundationccc.org/AbouttheColleges/FactsandFigures/tabid/636/Default.aspx

[2]   Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (n.d.). The Academic Senate in California: A brief history. http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Brief%20History.pdf

effort was coordinated by the ASCCC Relations with Local Senates Committee and was in addition to the Executive committee[3]. The geographical areas were called "Geoclusters" and the state's colleges were divided into fourteen clusters (http://goo.gl/9VnVEc)

In the 1990s, the Executive Committee was elected on an at-large basis. In the Spring 1995, resolutions 01.05 *Direct Election of Area Representatives* and 01.13 *Election of North And South Representatives* started a bylaws revision which created the current structure of the ASCCC Executive Committee: the four area representatives, two north, two south, and two at-large. The geoclusters were retained to function separate from the area divisions and provide an opportunity for geographically close colleges to meet more often to exchange information with their Executive Committee representation. The geoclusters concept proved less than successful: by the mid-1990s, as much of the information distribution needs had begun to be augmented with technology such as the internet and email, many of the geoclusters met only during area meetings, and the geoclusters struggled to schedule meeting times that area representatives could attend. Resolution 01.05 *Geocluster Reorganization* (F98) directed the development of a reorganization plan for the ASCCC Executive Committee including the following features:

1. Expand the four areas to six areas;

2. Eliminate the positions of North and South representatives, thus keeping the Executive Committee number the same; and

3. Eliminate the current geocluster structure but maintain current geographic representation on the Relations with Local Senates Committee.

The reorganization plan was presented to the body in the Spring 1999 and did not pass. The geocluster system was discontinued by resolution 01.01 *Geocluster Reorganization* (S99).

Two years after the dissolution of the geocluster system, the body was still expressing concern with the division of the senates throughout the state. Resolution 01.05 *Reconfiguring the Academic Senate Areas* (S01) raised the concern of geographic distance and resolved that the ASCCC "explore the feasibility of reconfiguring the areas from four to a minimum of six, all of which would retain the present system of election by area." The ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee found this resolution not feasible because "the reconfiguration of the areas would not address issues raised in the resolution" because adding two more areas would not alleviate the travel issues of the most impacted colleges.

WHERE WE ARE NOW

Currently, the ASCCC is divided into four areas: A, B, C, and D. In order to evaluate the division and compare it to other representational divisions of the community colleges in the state, the Relations with Local Senates Committee had to answer the following question: "What constitutes a division of representation that is 'adequate and equitable to the number and geographical distribution of local member senates?'" The committee evaluated the current representational division and the comparison divisions according to the following factors:

1. Number of Colleges

2. FTES Distribution (Number of Students Served) [4]

3. Staffing (Number of Fulltime Faculty) [5]

4. Types of colleges (Very Large, Large, Medium, & Small)[5]

5. Geography (Distance/Time to Travel)[6]

---

3 Clark, Kate. (2001). Increasing contact with local senates: A new charge for the Relations with Local Senates Committee and the Academic Senate Executive Committee. ASCCC *Rostrum.* http://asccc.org/content/increasing-contact-local-senates-new-charge-relations-local-senates-committee-and-academic

4 FTES Data from CCCCO DataMart: http://datamart.cccco.edu/Students/FTES_Summary.aspx

5 Staffing Data from CCCCO DataMart: http://employeedata.cccco.edu/statewide_summary_13.pdf

6 Calculated using Google Maps—note this did not take into account travel time impacted by traffic.

The following chart offers a breakdown of the ASCCC's current representative areas (http://goo.gl/IGboS2)

The current ASCCC Area divisions are relatively equally divided for the number of colleges, with a difference of seven between the highest and lowest, and the number of full-time faculty as areas are within 6% of one another. The large number of smaller rural colleges in Area A offsets the smaller number of colleges in Areas C and D, creating a 12% range between the areas regarding FTES. A discrepancy also exists between the time and distance, though the breakout presentation noted that at certain times of day driving the length of Area A might be preferable to trying to cross the Bay Area or Los Angeles County. The balance of the current ASCCC area divisions would seem to offer an equitable division of number of students, number of full-time faculty, and types of colleges over geographic proximity.

OTHER DIVISIONS OF THE STATE

The California Community College Association for Occupational Education (CCCAOE) divides the state into seven regions (http://goo.gl/EzkaJr)

While the CCCAOE representative structure is more balanced in terms of travel times, it provides an uneven distribution by FTES and full-time faculty. In particular, the division representing Los Angeles and Orange County would hold 30% of the full-time faculty and 35% of the FTES while the division representing the Desert colleges would represent 7% of the full-time faculty and 8% of the FTES. With this discrepancy in the proportions being represented, the faculty of the Central division would still have to travel over four hours to cross their representative area.

The Student Senate for California Community Colleges and the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) both divide the state up into ten areas (http://goo.gl/wNl2sj)

While the ACCCA and the Student Senate representative structure is, like the CCCAOE division of colleges, more balanced in terms of travel times than the current ASCCC division of areas, it still has two areas (II and IX) which have travel time in excess of four hours, while dropping the travel time of two areas (VII and VIII) to around an hour. The number of full-time faculty varies by 13% in the extreme and the number of FTES varies by 16%.

The difficulty of determining what constitutes an equitable representative structure for the ASCCC is that the geography of California is challenging, especially when trying to balance travel time with the size of the colleges and total number of faculty represented per area. If the ASCCC were to organize strictly on geographic travel times, the colleges would be divided in a manner that would be an unequitable division of the number of full-time faculty and FTES served by the colleges within the areas. Of the three divisions analyzed by the Relations with Local Senates Committee, the current ASCCC Area division seems to be the closet to a division of colleges equally divided by FTES and number of full-time faculty, yet having only four areas presents significant geographic challenges. The CCCAOE, ACCCA, and Student Senate divisions mitigate without completely solving the issues with travel but structure the colleges in a way that appears less equitable when considering the FTES and number of full-time faculty per area.

The Relations with Local Senates Committee provides this information to further inform the body and provoke continued conversation about how the ASCCC Executive committee might best be structured to represent the faculty of California Community Colleges. ✒